APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/224,918	01/04/99	HUNNICUTT	H `1001/028C

022801   TM02/0801
LEE & HAYES PLLC
421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500
SPOKANE WA 99201

EXAMINER
EDELMAN, B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2153	

DATE MAILED:
            08/01/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/224,918	Applicant(s) HUNNICUTT ET AL.
	Examiner Bradley Edelman	Art Unit 2153

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _02 May 2001_ .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1,3-5,7-15 and 17-49_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1,3-5,7-15 and 17-49_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

    If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

       1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

       2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

       3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

This action is in response to Applicant's amendment and Continued Prosecution Application filed on May 2, 2001. Claims 1, 3-5, 7-15, and 17-49 are presented for further examination. Claims 34-49 are new claims. Note that the new claims numbered by applicant as claims 33-48 have been re-numbered as claims 34-49 to comply with 35 USC 1.126.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

1.   Claims 1, 3, 7, 8, 14, 15, 17, 20-22, and 28-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Wobber et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,235,642, hereinafter "Wobber").

In considering claims 1, 15, and 31, Wobber discloses a system for a computer-implemented method, comprising:

means for checking a first memory (local cache 164) to determine if a user has previously accessed a requested resource on a computer network without performing a file open procedure upon a file which are stored any access permissions of users for access to the resource (col. 7, lines 32-36), upon receipt of an indication from the user to access the resource (col. 7, lines 22-24); and

providing the user with access to the resource if the first memory indicates that

the user has previously accessed the resource (col. 8, lines 31-35).

See also, the Abstract and Summary of the invention.

In considering claims 3 and 17, Wobber further discloses that the user is

represented in the first memory by a token (Auth ID, col. 7, lines 34-38).

In considering claims 7 and 21, Wobber further discloses that the resource is a

file (col. 4, line 21).

In considering claims 8 and 22, Wobber further discloses that the resource is a

volume of files (col. 4, line 21).

In considering claims 14 and 28, Wobber further discloses the request from the

user indicating an operation to perform with respect to the resource (i.e. access the

resource), and further comprising:

checking the first memory (local cache 164) to determine if the user may perform

the operation with respect to the resource (col. 7, lines 34-36);

checking a second memory (local cache 160) to determine if the user may

perform the operation with respect to the resource if the first memory does not indicate

that the user may perform the operation with respect to the resource (col. 7, lines 39-40,

44-45, 48-52);

providing the user with access to the resource if the second memory indicates

that the user may perform the operation with respect to the resource (col. 7, lines 50-

60); and

storing information in the first memory indicating that the user may perform the

operation with respect to the resource if, after checking the second memory, the second

memory indicates that the user may perform the operation with respect to the resource

(col. 7, lines 58-63).

In considering claim 20, Wobber further discloses authorizing the user by

checking a password (Auth ID) provided by the user; associating the token (Principal ID)

with the user after authorizing the user; and using the token to check the first memory

(col. 8, lines 1-30; col. 7, lines 55-62).

In considering claims 29 and 30, Wobber further discloses:

checking a second memory to determine if the user may access the resource if

the first memory does not indicate that the user has previously accessed the resource

(col. 7, lines 39-40, 44-45, 48-52);

providing the user with access to the resource if the second memory indicates

that the user may access the requested resource (col. 7, lines 50-60); and

storing information in the first memory indicating that the user may access the

resource if, after checking the second memory, the second memory indicates that the

user may access the requested resource (col. 7, lines 58-63).

In considering claim 32, Wobber further discloses performing a file open procedure upon the file in which are stored any access permissions of users for access to the requested resource to determine if the requesting user may access the requested resource if the memory does not indicate that the requesting user has previously accessed the requested resource (col. 7, line 64 – col. 8, line 22); and

providing the requesting user with access to the requested resource if the requested resource indicates that the requesting user may access the requested resource (col. 8, lines 23-30).

In considering claim 33, Wobber further discloses storing information in the memory indicating that the user has previously accessed the requested resource (col. 8, lines 22-30).

In considering claim 34, Wobber further discloses prior to checking the memory, performing a preliminary memory check to determine of the requesting use has previously accessed the computer network (col. 4, lines 37-65).

In considering claim 35, Wobber further discloses a machine-readable program storage device embodying instructions executable by a computer to perform a method for providing access to a plurality of resources to a plurality of requesting users wherein access to each said resource is controlled by a network server having a network memory, the method comprising:

receiving at the network server a resource request to access a requested

resource of said plurality of resources from one said requesting user (col. 4, lines 9-30),

wherein:

the network memory has stored therein which of said plurality of

requesting users had accessed which of said plurality of resources (col. 7, lines

34-36); and

an access file has stored therein any access permissions of any users for

access to the requested resource (col. 7, line 64 – col. 8, line 22);

without opening the access file, checking the network memory to determine if the

requesting user had accessed the requested resource (col. 7, lines 34-36); and

if the requesting user had accessed the requested resource, opening the

requested resource to provide access to the requesting user (col. 8, lines 31-35).

In considering claim 36, Wobber further discloses when the requesting user had

not previously accessed the requested resource:

opening the access file; checking the access file to determine if the requesting

user may have access to the requested resource; and if the check is affirmative, then

providing said access (col. 7, line 64 – col. 8, line 22).

In considering claim 37, Wobber discloses a resource access system comprising:

a network, including a plurality of resources, for transmitting a resource request

from a network user with access to the network for access to a requested resource of

said plurality of resources (col. 4, lines 9-30); and

a network server (node 102-1), in communication with the network, for:

receiving the resource request (col. 7, lines 22-24);

checking, without opening any of said plurality of resources, whether the

network user's resource request had been previously granted (col. 7, lines 34-

36); and

granting said access if the check is affirmative (col. 8, lines 31-34).

In considering claim 38, Wobber further discloses that granting said access

further comprises opening the requested resource for the network user to have said

access to the requested resource (col. 8, lines 34-35).

In considering claim 39, Wobber discloses a program for a resource access

system, the program being embodied on a computer-readable medium and executed on

a server that provides access to resources on a network, the program comprising: a

code segment to receive a resource request for access to one said resource from a

user having access to the network (col. 7, lines 22-24);

a code segment to check, without opening any of said resources on the network,

whether the user had previously been granted access to the requested resource (col. 7,

lines 34-36; and

a code segment to grant said access if the check is affirmative (col. 8, lines 31-35).

In considering claim 40, Wobber further discloses a code segment to open the requested resource for the user of the network to have said access to the requested resource if the check is affirmative (col. 8, lines 34-35).

In considering claim 41, Wobber discloses a method for controlling access to a requested resource on a computer network by a requesting user, the method comprising:

checking a first memory, without opening the requested resource, to determine if the requesting user has previously accessed the network (col. 7, lines 34-36); and

if the requesting user has previously accessed the network:

providing the requesting user with access to the network (col. 8, lines 31-35);

checking a second memory, without opening the requested resource, to determine if the requesting user has previously accessed the requested resource (col. 7, lines 48-52);

if the requesting user has previously accessed the requested resource then providing the requesting user with access to the requested resource (col. 7, lines 52-63); and

if the requesting user has not previously accessed the requested resource then

opening the requested resource to determine if the requesting user may access the

requested resource and if the requested resource indicates that the requesting user

may access the requested resource then providing the requesting user with access to

the requested resource (col. 7, line 64 – col. 8, line 22).

In considering claim 42, Wobber further discloses a resource access

determination method comprising: receiving a request for an access to a resource from

a user having had said access; and deciding the request without opening the resource

or contacting the user (col. 7, lines 22-24, 30-38; col. 8, lines 31-35).

In considering claim 43, Wobber discloses, prior to said receiving: receiving a

request for an access to the resource from the user who had not previously accessed

the resource; and obtaining any access privileges to the resource of the user without

contacting the user (col. 7, line 64 – col. 8, line 22; col. 8, lines 38-44).

In considering claim 44, Wobber discloses a resource access determination

method comprising:

receiving an initial request for an access to a resource from a user, and obtaining

an access privilege of the user to the resource without contacting the user (col. 7, line

64 – col. 8, line 22; col. 8, lines 38-44); and

if the user had the access privilege to the resource: granting the initial request;

receiving subsequent requests for subsequent accesses to the resource from the user;

and granting each said subsequent request without: opening the resource; or contacting

the user (col. 7, lines 22-38; col. 8, lines 31-35).

In considering claim 45, Wobber further discloses that granting the initial request

further comprises caching the result of said obtaining said access privilege of the user

to the resource (col. 8, lines 23-30); and

granting each said subsequent request further comprises comparing each said

subsequent request with said cached result of said obtaining said access privilege of

the user to the resource (col. 7, lines 34-48).

In considering claim 46, Wobber discloses a resource access determination

method comprising: receiving a request for an access to a resource from a user having

had said access; and deciding the request prior to contacting the user and without

opening the resource (col. 7, lines 22-38; col. 8, lines 31-35).

In considering claim 47, Wobber discloses in a system where resources are

protected by access checks that are performed to confirm that a user meets any

requirements for access to a particular resource, and where an access check is

performed the first time that the user requests access to the particular resource to

confirm that the user meets any requirements for access to the particular resource, a

method for determining whether the user should have access to the particular resource (col. 4, lines 9-30; col. 8, lines 1-22), the method comprising:

receiving a request from a user for access to a resource; checking the results of previous access request checks to determine if the user has previously been allowed access to the resource; if the user has previously been allowed access to the resource, then allowing access to the resource without performing an access check (col. 7, lines 22-38; col. 8, lines 31-35).

In considering claim 48, Wobber further discloses that the results of previous access request checks are cached in a cache (col. 8, lines 23-30).

In considering claim 49, Wobber discloses in a system where resources are protected by access checks that are performed to confirm that a user meets any requirements for access to a particular resource, where the requirements for each user to access each resource are stored in an access file, where an access check is performed the first time that the user requests access to the particular resource to confirm that the user meets any requirements for access to the particular resource, and where the access check that is performed the first time that the user requests access to the particular resource includes performing a file opening procedure upon the access file to determine the requirements for the user to access the particular resource (col. 7, line 64 – col. 8, line 22), a method for determining whether the user should have access to the particular resource, the method comprising:

receiving a request from a user for access to a resource (col. 7, lines 22-24);

checking the results of previous access request checks, without opening the

access file, to determine if the user has previously been allowed access to the resource

(col. 7, lines 34-36); and

if the user has previously been allowed access to the resource, then allowing

access to the resource without performing an access check (col. 8, lines 31-35).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2.   Claims 9-13, and 23-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Wobber, in view of what was well known in the art at the time the

invention was made.

In considering claims 9 and 23, Wobber fails to explicitly disclose that the

resource is a memory device (see col. 4, lines 21-24). However, Examiner takes official

notice that it is well known for networking systems to control access to memory devices,

as well as for software objects. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person having

ordinary skill in the art to use the access control system taught by Wobber for

networked memory devices in order to speed up the authorization process for access

requests made to such memory devices.

In considering claims 10 and 24, although the system taught by Wobber

discloses substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to explicitly disclose

storing of the information in the first memory comprising overwriting other information

associated with the resource in the first memory. Nonetheless, Examiner takes official

notice that it is well known in a network resource access system that authentication

information is often changed and can thus be overwritten. One reason to change

authentication information is to prevent tampering of the protected resources.

Therefore, given the likelihood of tampering, it would have been obvious to a person

having ordinary skill in the art to overwrite the token (Auth ID) taught by Wobber with a

new token submitted from the user to help prevent security breaches.

In considering claims 11 and 25, although the system taught by Wobber

discloses substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose writing a token

for the user in the first memory over another token for another user that had last

previous access to the resource. Nonetheless, Examiner takes official notice that

overwriting information related to access rights in a network system is well known.

Examiner takes further official notice that overwriting of data in a cache according to a

least-recently-used algorithm is well known. Thus, given these well known network

access functions, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art

to include the step of overwriting the least-recently-used tokens in the token cache in

the system taught by Wobber, in order to open up storage space in the token cache in

case the memory has become full.

In considering claims 12 and 26, although the system taught by Wobber

discloses substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose removing

indications from the first memory allowing access to the resource if the resource is

altered. Wobber instead proposes a time stamp for removing validity of the access

rights from the cache (col. 6, lines 21-22). Nonetheless, Examiner takes official notice

that removing user access rights to a network resource when the resource is altered is

well known. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the

art to remove user access rights to the resources taught by Wobber when the resource

is altered, in case the altered resource includes classified information which should not

be viewed by current users.

In considering claims 13 and 27, although the system taught by Wobber

discloses substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose removing

indications from the first memory allowing access to the resource if rights to the user are

altered. Wobber instead proposes a time stamp for removing validity of the access

rights from the cache (col. 6, lines 21-22). Nonetheless, Examiner takes official notice

that altering user access privileges to a resource in a network is well known. Thus, it

would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to remove

indications allowing access to the resource for users whose access rights have changed, so that users who have acted irresponsibly and who should no longer have access to the resources can be prevented from accessing the resources.

3.   Claims 4, 5, 18, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wobber, in view of Carlson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,506,961, hereinafter "Carlson").

In considering claims 4, 5, 18, and 19, although the system taught by Wobber discloses substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose that the token also represents anonymous users and/or a plurality of other users. Nonetheless, it is well known for multiple users of a networked system to maintain the same tokens (thus remaining anonymous) for user access to a resource, as evidenced by Carlson. In a similar art, Carlson teaches an access rights system that uses tokens to signify access rights of users to a network, wherein single tokens can identify a group of users (thus rendering the users anonymous; col. 8, line 63 – col. 9, line 5). Thus, given the teaching of Carlson, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability of representing multiple users with the same anonymous token to decrease the number of entries and amount of data in the cache, thus speeding up the cache look-up time. Therefore, it would have been obvious to represent a plurality of users in the system taught by Wobber with the same token, as suggested by Carlson.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are

moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record but not relied upon is considered pertinent to

Applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Bradley Edelman whose telephone number is (703) 306-

3041. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 8:30 AM to

5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Glen Burgess, can be reached on (703) 305-4792. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 305-7201.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or

proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-

3900.

Dung C. Dinh
Primary Examiner

BE

July 24, 2001